

**PUBLIC SAFETY RADIO STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
(PSRSPC)
MEETING NOTES
*Final***

**Thursday, July 28th, 2005
1:00 P.M. to 3:00 P.M.
Held at the Department of Education,
1430 N Street, Room 1101, Sacramento, CA**

Attendees

- Committee members (or designated reps)
- Staff, Department of General Services
- Staff, Governor's Office of Emergency Services
- Public observers (see attendee list included)
- Local and State agency interested parties

Documents Available

- √ Today's agenda
- √ Fact sheets on PSRSPC and CALSIEC
- √ PSRSPC Authorizing Legislation

Opening Remarks

Department of General Services Director, Mr. Ron Joseph, welcomed all participants and observers, and Mr. Henry Renteria, Director of the Governor's Office of Emergency Services offered opening comments. Both directors gave perspectives on the vital nature of pursuing state agency coordination and interoperability for California's radio system network. Both OES and DGS have been active with many efforts in the communication arena, including partnerships with local government and investigating new technological opportunities. Both executives stressed that it will be this Committee's tasking to bring the elusive goal of state agency "interoperability" to final fruition—to include both technological as well as procedural integration. Further, with the National Incident Management System (NIMS) being required by all states, as well as the clear legislative mandate, coordinated work on these critical issues must be engaged by all agencies involved.

Mr. Joseph commented that in 1997 the Committee developed a strategic plan that stated the lack of effective and reliable radio communications was impeding California's public safety agencies' ability to perform their most elemental mission--the protection of life and property. Since that time, the unfortunate conclusion is that the state has continued to ebb toward technological obsolescence each passing year. However, Mr. Joseph added those in attendance today are confident that the issues can be addressed and overcome and that DGS will remain committed to serve in these efforts.

Mr. Renteria commented that California has experienced interoperability challenges for many decades. However, due to its strong master mutual aid systems and methods of establishing collaborating processes, strong coordinating systems have been long recognized; specifically, the California Law Enforcement Mutual Aid Radio System (CLEMARS) and the California On Scene Emergency Coordination radio system, (CALCORD). Over the past two decades these two systems were incorporated as best practices into three federal advisory committee reports dealing with the topic of interoperability.

The CA OES staff and other state agencies have been involved in a number of regional interoperability initiatives since the September 11 disaster in New York City. Some of the systems that have been examined (the Regional Communications Systems in San Diego and Imperial Counties; the Los Angeles Regional Tactical Communications System and Multi City Interagency Communications Interoperability System in Los Angeles County; the Silicon Valley Regional Interoperability Program; the Fresno Area Gold Star Program, San Francisco Urban Area interoperability initiative, and the Sacramento Regional Radio Communications System) combine city and county radio networks very effectively.

The CA OES staff members have also been active in the interoperability coordination efforts at the national level, including serving in an advisory capacity to the Department of Homeland Security's SAFECOM Program. The various systems must be modernized to keep them up and running and in service, and to meet federal regulations. At the onset of the process, Committee agencies had a vision of developing interagency interoperability as part of the modernization process. However, in the post September 11th environment, it has become critical to achieve state agency interoperability in order to comply with the requirements of California's Standardized Emergency Management Systems (SEMS) which, according to statute, all state agencies must follow. The National Incident Management System (NIMS) has now been adopted and is required to be used by all fifty States. The NIMS is based on the SEMS and the Incident Command System.

California's Legislature has tasked this Committee, comprised of state agencies currently operating public safety radio networks, to handle the state agency portion of the interoperability process. Mr. Renteria commented that the Governor is very committed to moving forward on this critical requirement and has inquired often as to California's status regarding the interoperability issue. His desire is for the state to move forward in a collaborative, cost effective manner and achieve interoperability with our local and federal agency partners as quickly as possible. An expressed meeting goal was to begin the process tasked to us by the Legislature, so that we can continue to meet the service needs of our public and our first responders.

Commissioner Comments and Staff Reports

All agency representatives introduced themselves and introductory comments were turned over to Tom Worden, Chief Technology Officer, CA OES.

Mr. Worden thanked Robert Samaan of the Governor's Office of Homeland Security, a new member agency, consultative organizations, and existing member agencies for their attendance. He added the Legislature created the Committee in 2002 to ensure collaboration between the agencies and professional associations in the public safety environment and to better establish a close and positive relationship with the organizations in their strong background of experience. When public meetings are held, all of the consultative organizations will be invited to attend.

Because of a diverse representation of professionals in the area, individuals with broad experience can be relied upon for strong opinions. Copies distributed show a synopsis of the Public Safety Communications Act of 2002 and subsequent legislative interest in the committee. The original Committee was established in the '90s, and worked to develop the state's needs. However, since September 11th 2001, the Committee's responsibilities have changed to modernize the state's interoperability among its own departments to coincide with the new interoperability challenges within the local and federal government levels

Mr. Worden added it is important to differentiate that it is not this Committee's goal to establish the practices for interoperability in the state, as that process is already on-going; however, it is the Committee's charge to make sure that the state's investment in radio modernization enhances interoperability among state and local entities. It is also the Committee's responsibility to ensure that

as we build to a new radio system, we continue to make agreements with existing, locally owned, or regionally owned radio systems throughout the state. Consequently, state law enforcement, fire fighters, or others from the state work force can interact in those systems—financially and electronically employing practical methods.

The Legislature recognizes that those agreements will vary from system to system and region to region. It is the state's responsibility to bear the burden of being flexible to join the local systems as they exist, rather than placing the burden on the local system. It is the Legislation's goal to develop a model MOU. However, from past experience there is no single document that could handle interaction with all of the various local and regional agencies. The model MOU will come as we coordinate and drive toward coordinated, interoperable systems.

The original authorizing legislation for the Committee charged the group with addressing modernization of all state radio systems and procedures consistent with interoperability parameters. A current legislative proposal, AB 1559 (Gordon, Cohn), would task the California Statewide Interoperability Executive Committee (CALSIEC) and the PSRSPC to form a joint committee to report in early 2006 on a plan to have all 'frontline' response agencies fully interoperable.

There are approximately 40 CALSIEC members representing state agencies and local agencies that comprise all the public safety disciplines, from all regions of the state, and from all sizes of local government, from large urban areas to rural areas. With the complimentary and sometimes concurrent expectations of the PSRSPC and CALSIEC, both efforts—as well as others going in California—need to work together in a highly collaborative fashion. PSRSPC may, indeed, be the best group to coordinate the efforts of these other entities together and act as the primary body for radio communication interoperability and improvements.

The Legislature also requires an annual report; the next report is due January 1, 2006. The report must include the progress made so far on the goals of equipment modernization and interoperability. The pending legislative report requirements began a discussion among committee members that the Committee itself lacked direction and was at a disadvantage to move forward without a clearer set of goals, objectives, and a mission; a "process to move forward" was voiced as being needed—to guide the work of the committee and assigned staff towards the annual report and other required deliverables.

New Business

Chair elected. The Committee elected a new Chairman—the Director of the Office of Emergency Services, Mr. Henry Renteria. It was also agreed upon that, in the future, the Chair would be selected by organization, not by name; whomever is in the executive position at that time would serve as the agency's representative as Chair.

Proposal for contracted technology evaluation. CA OES staff discussed a written proposal to enlist the aid of outside consultants to evaluate technology and agency needs in the pursuit of interoperable communication improvements. Committee members addressed the details of the proposal and some concern was raised that an approach such as this was premature and not yet viable, given the more pressing structural needs of the effort overall to solidify a direction.

Contracted facilitation support. The Committee held a vigorous dialogue regarding the need to quickly design a process that would allow the Committee to move forward on important issues facing the effort. As the group had not met in over a year, there was a clear desire to convene often and aggressively to achieve progress towards their legislated mandates. It was emphasized that since the last meeting, interoperability has moved forward, the demand for interoperability has not ceased, and individual state departments and locals have continued to develop their own specific communication

plans and strategies. With the need for a clear mission, achievable goals, and set tasks to move forward along a “road map” towards state & local interoperability, the Committee voted their support for an outside consultancy group to provide facilitation and policy guidance. Sacramento State University’s Center for Collaborative Policy will provide this function for the Committee and its sub-units.

Guidance for the Technical Working Group

In order to address the need for organization and focus, the Committee re-instituted the *Technical Working Group* to provide the staff level support for the work required to fulfill the mandate of the Committee. The Work Group was tasked with the following actions:

- Convene as a Working Group of the full Committee to provide a venue for interagency staff work and coordination;
- The Work Group should develop a governance tool to guide its work on behalf of the Committee;
- Develop a recommended Work Plan to achieve the mandates as written by the legislature;
- Develop a clear set of goals, objectives and tasks as needed to provide a methodology to move the overall effort forward with clarity and purpose—serving the needs of both the TWG and the full committee;
- Understand that the effort of the Committee is at a “foundation building” step right now; specific equipment issues should wait for the time being—what is needed is a “plan” that outlines a process to follow that will eventually lead the Committee through an orderly decision making effort on equipment later on.

The Working Group was tasked to meet quickly and as often as necessary to complete its work as assigned by the Committee. All the Committee members present offered staff representatives to the Work Group to accomplish its work.

Public Comments

Comments from Alameda County GSA Deputy Director Randall Hagar

A local official from **Alameda County** offered the observation to the Committee that their jurisdiction is struggling with governance issues overall. Regional efforts are underway that are quite progressive; they could be seen, in fact, as being more advanced than state progress. Many local entities and regional coalitions have purchased major communication systems with funds available through homeland security grants. The state must move quickly to support the efforts of local government and be mindful of the “all or nothing” approach towards interoperable equipment—the overarching key is *integration* of differing systems on a common architecture. With this approach, there is not as much pressure to buy a certain system; the more important issue is to buy a system that can communicate with others.

Comments from Region 6 – 700 MHz and 4.9 GHz Regional Planning Committee Chair Bill De Camp

A state official from the **CA Department of General Services** discussed the need to concentrate on user needs and commonalities, rather than the technologies themselves. Also, the need to allocate spectrum through the state license is time-sensitive; several state agencies as well as local governments are in need of the space. A suggestion was made to convene a subcommittee on this particular topic.

Comments from DOJ Telecommunications Systems Manager Josue Guzman

A state official from the **CA Department of Justice** offered their agency's assistance in working with the Committee and would provide any internal analysis needed on current communication systems.

Comments from Dept. of General Services

An executive with the **CA Department of General Services** offered the Committee the observation that all agencies in CA are in dire need for a clear plan on how to move towards interoperability that will allow state agencies the ability to buy compatible communication systems. This needed plan should be general in nature and provide a process that is simple to follow for the everyday user. Money will also become critical once more decisions on system changes can be made.

Next Meeting of PSRSPC

A motion was carried that the PSRSPC should meet every other month for the near-term, to ensure that progress and commitment to the effort remains strong (with the caveat that meetings can be called, or cancelled, should circumstances warrant). As such, the next meeting was scheduled for September 28th, 1:00 to 3:00 P.M. *(Subsequently decided to be held at CA OES headquarters in Rancho Cordova.)*

Closing Comments

CA OES Director, Henry Renteria, observed that "communication" invariably comes forward as one of the primary findings of every After Action report, whether from an exercise or an actual disaster. We need a clear and accepted definition of "interoperability" that encompasses both equipment issues as well as procedural and organizational norms. The efforts of the PSRSPC are also not a "state" issue alone; we need to work in close coordination and partnership with local government on all aspects of this challenge if we are to succeed for California.

Attachment I: Attendees

Committee Representatives

Ken Chappelle – Department of Corrections, Rehabilitation (CDCR)
Steve Edinger – Department of Fish and Game (DFG)
Sonny Fong – Department of Water Resources (DWR)
Kevin Greene – California Highway Patrol (CHP)
Ronald Joseph – Department of General Services (DGS)
Ferdinand Milanes – Department of Transportation (DOT)
Henry Renteria – Office of Emergency Services (OES)
Robert Samaan – Office of Homeland Security
Glen Savage - Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF)
Randy Sederquist – Department of Parks and Recreation (P&R)
Bonnie Sinz – Emergency Medical Safety Authority (EMSA)
Tom Worden - OES

Others Present

Bill Anderson – DGS, Telecom. Div. (DGS-TD)	Neil Hiller – Motorola
Carolyn Baker – DGS	Doug Hoffner – DGS
Daryl Ballard – CDCR, Juvenile Justice	Kim Ismail – Department of Justice (DOJ)
Timothy Bow – Dept. of Health Services (CDHS)	Joann Marsh – DGS, TD
Marlo Brush – CA OES, T-Comm	Michael Minor - CDCR
Sandra Champion – CHP, Telecom. Section	Kim Mitchell – CHP
Reginald Chappelle - CHP	Frank McCarton – CA OES, Executive
Mary Cook – EMSA	Jake McHatton – CA OES, T-Comm
Tina Curry – CA OES, Executive	Glen Nash – DGS, TD
Bill DeCamp – DGS, TD	Markell Pierce – CDHS, EPO
Dennis Elwell – DGS, TD	Paula Reynaga – DGS, TD
Richard Engelsen – DFG	Don Root – CA OES, T-Comm
Victor M. Garcia – DWR	Charlie Simpson – CA OES, Law Enforcement
Gary Grootveld – DGS, TD	Adam Sutkus – CSUS, Center for Collaborative Policy
Randy Hagar – Alameda County GSA	Sheryl Tankersley – OES-OPA
Barry Hemphill – DGS, TD	